



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,051		06/20/2001	Heikki Einola	PM 276663	7538
909	7590	08/02/2005		EXAMINER	
		THROP SHAW PIT	DAGOSTA, STEPHEN M		
P.O. BOX 10 MCLEAN,		02	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•				2683	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/762,051	EINOLA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2683				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state of the period for reply will, by state of the period for reply will, by state of the period for reply will be office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15	<u>5 July 2005</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ T	his action is non-final.	•				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 2-11 and 14-20 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 2-11 and 14-18 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to t						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bure	ents have been received. ents have been received in Application riority documents have been received and (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a I	ist of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Application/Control Number: 09/762,051

Art Unit: 2683

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

A new office action is found attached in response to the applicant's RCE filed July 15th 2005. Claims 2-11 and 14-18 are allowed. Claims 19-20 are rejected due to the fact that they are broadly written and read on the prior art cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

<u>Claims 19-20</u> rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett et al. US 6,766,453 and further in view of Obayashi et al. US 5,564,077 and Schuster et al. US 6,857,072.

As per claims 19-20, Nessett teaches a network part in a first mobile communication network configured to use a first cipher key for ciphering traffic between the first mobile communication network and a mobile station, wherein the network part is configured to calculate, as the mobile station operates in the first mobile network (title, abstract, C1, L29 to C2, L33),

the network part is further configured to transmit information necessary for calculating the second cipher key from the first mobile communication network to the mobile station (C2, L40 to C3, L36 teaches interaction between a mobile user and the network's RADIUS server download of a key to the user from the server/network).

but is silent on a second cipher key to be used for ciphering in a second mobile communication network,

Application/Control Number: 09/762,051

Art Unit: 2683

the network part is configured to transmit the second cipher key to the second mobile communication network to be used for cipher traffic after the handover using the second cipher key, and

the network part is configured to transmit a request to the mobile station for handover to the second mobile communication network.

The primary examiner notes that a new key will inherently be required should either the network change (eg. mobile user roams into a new service area) and/or a connection is made to a different end user (eg. call a new/second person).

Obayahsi teaches a dual mode phone that can switch between analog and digital systems (title, abstract). Inherent to this operation from one mode to another is all the underlying switching that must occur to allow the phone to switch internal hardware configurations as well as change RF channels (figures 15-16 and 18 show "switching processing"). Obayahsi also teaches handoff support (see figure 11). Hence, one skilled understands that using Nessett's encryption scheme in a phone that can roam to different networks will require Nessett's system to send a new key to the second network if the phone is to continue operating in a secure mode in said second network.

Further to this point is **Schuster** who enables encryption/authentication of a telephony network (figures 1-2 and 8-10) between users that connects over multiple networks (figure 1 shows first access network #112, data network #106 and second access network #114).

With further regard to claim 20, Nessett discloses at least three well known techniques for authentication (C1, L30 to C2, L33). The techniques disclose that either the user or network can calculate cipher keys and/or perform ciphering calculations, which reads on the mobile calculating a second key and transmitting it to the second network.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nessett, such that a second cipher key to be used for ciphering in a second mobile communication network AND the network part is configured to transmit the second cipher key to the second mobile communication network to be used for cipher

traffic after the handover using the second cipher key AND the network part is configured to transmit a request to the mobile station for handover to the second mobile communication network, to provide for a user to change to a different encryption means while they roam to different networks.

Allowable Subject Matter

<u>Claims 2-11 and 14-18</u> are allowed since the applicant has amended per the primary examiner's recommendations. These claims, in the examiner's opinion, recite novel limitations.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- 1. Rune 5,850,444
- 2. Zuili et al. US 6,145,084
- 3. Murphy et al. US 6,314,468

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 571-272-7862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2683

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen D'Agosta Primary Examiner 7-22-2005